

29 August 1985: Conversation with Alan Neidle, former deputy (?) to Paul Warnke working day to day on CTB negotiations under Carter; earlier, a junior officer working on Limited Test Ban under Kennedy.

a\Why CTB is not a promising vehicle for significant progress in arms control, not matter who is President. Carter really wanted it...made rapid progress, B made

Late 77, Warnke said , You can't stop it now, Alan, there will be a test ban...after SU concessions...we all believed that ...it crumbled long before Afghanistan...Labs, JCS....Pentagon...//Carter couldn't handle it.

Test ban controls arms race indirectly...like fissionable material cutoff...activity that is activity and monitorable.

This goes against grain of people who say, Maybe you need to ...People who don't want any arms control, say, You need to test to have a reliable deterrent.

May says, Testing restraints are the wrong way to go...blunderbuss...(May is for SALT type restraints),

I have found, having labored in these trenches indefinitely, that it is very hard, virtually impossible, to get strong enough support, once people have learned the issues, to oppose testing against a President who wants to get new weapons.

Even with enough Carter, you would still have a military that will say that while we have these weapons we have to have reliability...they will agitate this on the Hill...there will be reasonable, middle of the road folk

You can argue that you can do non-explosive testing for reliability...Mark, Garwin, Brabury...

But you still need  
You will have to convince people

Even if you buy the Mrk thesis--you don't prove there will never be a diminution in reliability...some are robust, some not...Zelots for testing say, why should we take a chance?

What worries people is not a statistical reliability that applies to missiles as while; but a fear that over time a catastrophic failure may have failed in --an unforeseen failure in a particular material, that affects a whole class of weapon



Uncertainty about reliability--and military saying its better not to take the risk.

Test ban now would do symbolic things, but relitively little about coming weapons, thatpeople are concrned about. It Even Only the X-ray laser (and even thereyou have ground-based lasers...)

Proliferation: you can't prove, to opponents of test ban, that you will inhibit specific countries from testing. From ban, you would get much stronger leverage in resisting the proliferators...diplomatic leverage...but weh n you're up there on the Hill, peole will hear both sides, they will hear from opponents that benefits tha]]are indirect at best.

Study for NY Bar Associatins. Most peoople are focussed on bi measures; or, unequally unachievable Gayler's deep cuts. Our study: retain commitment to CTB...but negotiated when there is a prospect ofof a cuoncrete results in the main negotiatins.

If you do solve problem of offense-defense relationship, SALT III type, it that's in sight, then you have a logival case for, a aCTB. That is, people have to see

\Majority for resolutions that a CTB be negotiated, but these are people who haven't looked into it,,,thy would like to see SALT iii, good arms control...but not prepared to cpmfrpmt a [p[i;are {resodemt

won't confront a populare President who says we need new weapons...

What we need is to confront issue of new weapons...especially Star Wars, which is about to destroy all restraint

We've got a good case: public poll says they will not support

Non-alined countries wil talk a big game, but they won't do anything...and they

they won't withdraw and they won't make nuclear weapons; for regional reasons...their diplomacy is very noisy, sticking thumbs in the superpowers eyes; the countries will make nuclearweapons because they need them, not because we're testing. Test ban is desirable for opposing horizontal proliferation...showing that future is not dominated by the importance of these weapons...you are not committed to inifinite improvement...it would help with horizontal pfolif. There are non-nuclear countries who would like to hhelp oppose prolife...test ban would halp them with their efforts, as with



nuclear suppliers;...WWest Germany, Mexico...

The best you could do now, which is likely to be a false start, as under Carter ...thatr would put us further behaind York's views are much the same...do a test ban when you have better prospects

I was alternative representative for Warnke in 77 and 78 York took Warnkes job on this When W left gov in late 78, head of ACDA beame Seignious; York became negotiator; Neidle assisted for a month, then returned

a

By summer of 78, we were in big trouble...July

arter was taken to the cleaners,,,had Zbig next to him, not keen to reach agreements with the SU

WHy SU offer shouldn't be ttaken too seriiously. When we were serious, they were't interested ina mortatorium...when you expect a test ban, you want toget as many tests in as possible...Their advisors have told them now that this proplsal is perfectly safe, it will never be taken up by the US....they can read the politics

They want good propaganda... (not over here? no t in Europe...a little...

you can't argue as an abosolute that youwill never want any new nuclear weapons

The risk of nuclear war did go down withthe LTB because of cahgne in political climate, mof]ve toward detente, showed common inteinterests with SU...really biggest change was under Nixon with Berlin agreements and the SALT agreements....real danger now is return to CWm but we have nt gone all the way back from detente...Nixon

Best thing SU had accepted procedures for invchallenge inspectsiion,,,raised the stakes for rejecting an inspectio

schlesinger isn't a test ban supporter at all...Brownwas a supporter at first...got lukewarm, didn't handle the military al that welll, probable view similar to mine...good and strong position on Star wars. see Chlesinger also against Star Wars...Int Sec article;;; Borwn in Survival, this or last issue...

ASAT is going forward, and might be feasible, unlike rest of Star Wars. George Brown is mad, Pres was to negotiate on StarASAT...bill hasn't passed yet

These are very deep historical American problems...our privileged history, never having suffered hideous damage, never invaded...legalistic view, moralistic, hard to deal with Russians, not cheek by jowl with others...religious fundamentalism, terribly serious problem of human problems, maturity problem of knowing your limits; West glorified in the movies;;;]who better to lead a nation that has no limits than someone who had no limits in the movies....we've lost our economic domination of the world

all this was so many people are susceptible to simplistic solutions...its why we have the President we have...

the SU becomes the threat to what we think was best in us...freedom, ability to grow....Aristocratic leaders like Churchill and Giscard aren't interested in plebian morals,,...they want to deal with men of power...our leaders want to reform enemy or abolish it, evil empire;